



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

76

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/625,071	07/22/2003	Hamid Hojaji	50699/10	5934
1912	7590	04/12/2006		EXAMINER
AMSTER, ROTHSTEIN & EBENSTEIN LLP 90 PARK AVENUE NEW YORK, NY 10016				CHAPMAN, JEANETTE E
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
				3635

DATE MAILED: 04/12/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/625,071	HOJAJI ET AL.
	Examiner Chapman E. Jeanette	Art Unit 3635

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 July 2005.  
 2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.  
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-89 is/are pending in the application.  
 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
 6) Claim(s) 1-89 is/are rejected.  
 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 9/16/05, 7/22/03.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)  
 6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-27, 31-59 and 63-85 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Haines et al (5821184) in view of Pavlov et al (5588977) or alternatively, Pavlov in view of Haines.

Haines et al discloses a foam glass blocks of various and numerous densities and pore sizes ranging from 7lb/ft<sup>3</sup> –42.6 lb/ft<sup>3</sup> in density and from .01mm-5mm in pore size. See examples 1-18. These values meet the recited range values and measurements. Haines further discloses that a pore of adhesive compound, thus a closed pore skin, could be applied to one side of a 1-2 inch size block or disk. The measurements in width and thickness and length vary greatly. See examples 1,3,5, 7, 9, 11, 15. One of ordinary skill in the art would have appreciated the use and designed the properties/measurements most conducive to the use.

Pavlov et al discloses foam glass for tiles in roofs of buildings and for tiles in internal wall lining and external wall surfacing. The foam glass tile includes a density of 64.427 lb/ft<sup>3</sup> (converted from 1000 kg/mm<sup>3</sup> ) and a compression strength of 8700 lb/ft<sup>2</sup>. (converted from 60Mpa). Pavlov et al states the pore side can vary depending on the method of making. One of ordinary skill in the art would have appreciated that the measurement values change with the method of making and the method of use. One of

ordinary skill in the art would have appreciated arriving at measurement values commensurate with the use. From both references, one of ordinary skill in the art appreciates how these values or properties change with the different methods of making. It is clear that if the block or tile is subjected to major compressive forces, you would desire a tile with a maximum compression strength. So variations in the weight over 65 lbs, the width, the thickness, etc.... and the compressive strength over 10,000 lb/ft<sup>2</sup> are viewed as choices obvious to obtain thru option method of making subject to the discretion of use of the article. One of ordinary skill in the art would have appreciated modifying Haines in view of Pavlov or Pavlov in view of Haines to arrive at the foam glass tile with the desired properties and characteristics while using the method to achieve the desired properties and characteristics. With the foam glass having the recited properties, the same is able to withstand /resistant earthquake damage.

Claims 29-30, 60-62, 86-89 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the above references as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Fukumoto et al. The tile of Fukumoot et al comprises a closed cell structure and a decorative tile design including an interior portion 10 and the tile outer skin comprises an additive 12 or a pigment to make its surface appear a different color than the interior portion of the tile. The tile may be used in a building or lightweight building façade (column 6, lines 1-12) and having the same recited values as the prior art the same is capable of withstanding earthquake damage.

Glass is known to be made with a textured or glazed surface for aesthetic appeal. The glaze layer is disclosed by Fukumoto et al as conventional. However, One of ordinary skill in the art would have added these decorative effects for aesthetic appeal. The same has no bearing on the overall structure and function of the glass.

In view of the above it would have been obvious to decorate the tile using any means known today and appealing to the user or maker as shown by Fukumoto et al.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chapman E. Jeanette whose telephone number is 571-272-6841. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-thursday, 8:30-6:00, every fri. off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Friedman Carl can be reached on 571-272-6842. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

jec

  
Jeanette Chapman  
Primary Examiner